

## **Amador County Pesticide Use Enforcement Work Plan 2016-2018**

### **County Resources**

- Commissioner—25% of time in PUE
- Agricultural Inspector II—50% of time in PUE
- Agricultural Inspector I—20% of time in training
- All staff have vehicles for exclusive use
- Each vehicle has radio contact with office and other staff in the field
- Licensed staff have computer workstations for issuing restricted materials permits and operator ID numbers, each with access to internet and email
- One workstation is compatible with Arcview and is used for GIS mapping
- Currently using CalAg Permits for permit/OPID issuance and use report input

### **A. Restricted Materials Permitting**

#### **Permit Evaluation**

- Approximately 65 restricted materials permits issued annually
- Majority of permits are issued for phenoxy herbicides, paraquat, strychnine, zinc phosphide, and aluminum phosphide
- Permits are approved and issued by two licensed staff
  - Commissioner-5% of PUE duties
  - Agricultural Inspector-20% of PUE duties
- For new permits initial contact by phone or in person to prescreen for hazards necessitating denials
- Permit approved through verification of having passed private or qualified applicator certification exam
- County administers private applicator certification exam on an individual basis
- Appointment is required for permit issuance and certification exam
- Permit issuance takes approximately one hour
- Testing takes approximately one hour
- During issuance we conduct review of adjacent and surrounding properties based on the following to determine potential adverse environmental impact or health effects:
  - Maps submitted by the applicant or prepared by GIS aerial photographs
  - Discussion with the applicant
  - Knowledge of the local area
- Permits are denied or conditioned recognizing and utilizing appropriate mitigation measures
- If a permit is denied the applicant will be given due process in the form of a notice and an opportunity to be heard
- Permits are entered into CalAg Permits, never issued on PR ENF-125, and printed out for signature
- Permits are issued to operator of property or authorized representative (either an employee, farm management firm or PCA), non-ag permits are issued to PCB

- Letter of authorization required for issuance or signature of other than operator of property
- Permits are valid for one year, expiring at the end of the calendar year in which they are issued
- All agricultural permits are site specific and maps are required
- Sites are identified by a three digit alpha numeric system, typically the letter identified with a map and the number identified with a location or commodity within map
- Homes, wells, adjacent environment, and sensitive areas are identified on maps
- Handouts reviewed with permittee at time of issuance:
  - In house pesticide use requirements
  - DPR pesticide use requirements PR-ENF-116
  - PUR form and instructions
  - Restricted material permit conditions
  - Notice of intent log and instructions
  - California restricted materials list
  - DPR WPS brochures
  - Handler and fieldworker training program/records
  - Application specific information requirements
  - PSIS A or N 1-10
- For permit amendments, a notation is made on the permit for small changes, while larger, more significant changes require the permittee to sign and date the amendment
- Permit/certification renewals usually occur after county sponsored continuing education opportunity/training offered in December
- Three scheduled CE/training sessions per year
- For renewals, prior year permit files are reviewed for PURs and inspections to determine any potential problem areas
- Permits that include restricted material use pesticides that have not been used in the previous year are reviewed with permittee during permit renewal season to eliminate these pesticides from the permits

### Strengths

- Staff knowledge of local conditions helps to reduce substantial adverse environmental impacts
- Currently there is a low level of ag-urban interface issues
- Very low level of cropping pattern problems
- Historically there have been few to no instances of permit denials due to potential adverse environmental impacts
- Issuance of one year permits even for permanent crops allows for regular review of permits, reducing chances for potential adverse impacts
- Specific permit conditions are generally never required due to the cropping patterns and types of restricted materials used
- 75% of the agricultural permit sites have been GPS mapped and sensitive sites and wells identified on them. New permits are mapped through the CalAg Permits system

### Weaknesses

- Staff has limited background experience in specific pesticides, their labeled uses, and mode of action

### Goal or Objective

- Assure that the evaluation process for restricted material permit applications is complete and thorough, taking into consideration all aspects of risk assessment through the use of updates and improvements to permit information necessary to make sound determinations on adverse effects
- Improve the restricted materials permit application process through additional label review for new product usage

### Deliverables

- Review county GIS parcel data, aerial photographs, and web based map systems prior to issuing new restricted material permits to assess potential adverse effects
- Evaluate 100% of restricted material permits where adjoining site conditions have changed for potential adverse environmental impacts
- Approve, deny, and condition permit as necessary. Ensure due process.
- Review and amend permit conditions to be pesticide specific and site specific when necessary

### Measure Success

- Review all restricted material permit files for the following corrective actions:
  - Site specific color GIS and aerial photo maps
  - Elimination of restricted materials not used for the last year
- Identify number of permits lacking corrections
- Review of occurrence of adverse incidents where we had a high degree of control based on corrections implemented to permit and NOI review process

### **Site Monitoring Plan Development**

- Approximately 475 annual sites
- Approximately 40 NOIs are received a year
- 24 hour NOIs are required
- NOIs are accepted by telephone to the main telephone line, fax, or in person and are monitored between 8 am-5 pm, Mondays –Fridays
- After hours the NOIs are picked up by answering machine. No NOIs are picked up by staff on weekends
- The secretary transcribes NOIs to an in house log that is kept in a file in the office
- Licensed staff review NOI log periodically to assure consistency with permit and contains required information

- Majority of NOIs are for the following restricted materials/crops:
  - Phenoxy herbicides for forest, received during April and May
  - Phenoxy herbicides for forage crops, received during January through April
  - Paraquat for wine grapes, received during December through March
  - Aluminum phosphide and strychnine for wine grapes, received May to October
- NOIs are reviewed by two licensed staff
  - Commissioner – 5% of PUE duties
  - Agricultural Inspector – 5% of PUE duties
- Sites to evaluate are based on:
  - hazard of pesticide use by crop
  - previous denials
  - aerial applications
  - applications near roads and residences
  - environment condition with respect to cropping and fieldwork patterns
  - local conditions
  - employee handlers
  - compliance histories
- Pre-application site inspections are performed as resources allow
- All nonagricultural permits are required to submit an NOI until one inspection has been performed which is usually accomplished when the renewal occurs for an upcoming application

#### Strengths

- Staff with knowledge of local conditions and cropping patterns
- Few types of restricted materials used on a few crops
- Minimal changes to adjacent environments of sites to be monitored

#### Weaknesses

- Many NOIs are submitted on weekends making it difficult to conduct review of NOI prior to application as no staff works on weekends
- Limited staff availability for site monitoring due to the majority of site monitoring occurring at a time of year when licensed staff is performing other duties such as issuing renewals for permits and operator identification numbers or performing county roadside vegetation management

#### Goal or Objective

- Assure that site-monitoring for restricted material use is effective, preventative and comprehensive, taking into consideration the following risk factors:
  - Pesticide hazards associated with
    - phenoxy herbicides

- paraquat
  - strychnine and zinc/aluminum phosphide
- Local conditions
  - new residential developments within the ag-urban interface
- Cropping and fieldwork patterns
- Compliance histories
  - employee handlers
  - permittee
  - pest control advisors

### Deliverables

- Record and evaluate all NOI's
- Use the pesticide pre-application site inspection, compliance actions and NOI denials to increase compliance with 24 hour NOI permit requirement.
- Review of NOI log to determine if:
  - Increase in timely reviews of NOIs by staff occurred
  - Reduction in number of non-compliances for 24 hour NOI requirement
- Each NOI will be reviewed by licensed staff to ensure:
  - Valid Restricted Materials Permit for material to be applied to the intended site
  - Crop or application site is allowed by label/Section 18/permit conditions
  - Method of application is allowed by pesticide label & permit conditions
  - Dilution/volume per acre is appropriate
  - Material is appropriate for the pest to be controlled
  - Surrounding areas will not be adversely impacted by application
- Record all reviewed NOIs on PRAMR
- Pre-application site inspections will be performed on a minimum of 5% of NOIs, approximately 5/year.
- All NOI's that are denied shall be recorded on a NOI denial form and counted for the PRAMR and filed.
- Requests for recommendations will be increased to better evaluate risks associated with proposed applications.

### Measure Success

- Review of PRAMR to determine if all reviewed NOIs have been accounted for
- Review of PRAMR to determine if required 5% pre-application site inspections were performed
- Review success of Phenoxy buffers and recommendations for decrease in potential or actual risks

## **B. Compliance Monitoring**

## **Comprehensive Inspection Plan**

- Inspections are performed by one licensed staff
  - Agricultural Inspector- 50% of PUE duties
- Inspections are performed between 8 am-5 pm, Mondays-Fridays
- 60% of inspections are scheduled
  - grower and pest control business headquarter safety and records
  - pre-application site
  - restricted materials
- Majority of scheduled restricted material application inspections occur between December and April when weed control takes place for field crops with phenoxy herbicides and for wine grapes with paraquat
- 25% of the inspections are targeted and are concentrated in the major agricultural pesticide application areas, the Shenandoah Valley and Jackson Valley, where wine grapes are grown
- Targeted inspections are prioritized by:
  - Applicator compliance history
  - Employee handlers
  - Environmental concerns
  - Chemical hazards
- 15% of inspections are random in urban areas
  - landscape maintenance
  - structural pest control businesses
- Surveillance for non scheduled application inspections occurs depending on availability of staff

## **Strengths**

- The size and centralized location of the agricultural pesticide application areas allows for an intimate familiarity with pesticide usage and cropping patterns in the county.
- Implementation of a comprehensive GIS site-mapping program.
- Implementation of a non-compliance tracking system utilizing copies of all inspections in permittee file and annual comparison spreadsheet
- A targeted inspection plan that addresses the following components:
  - Violation history
  - Potential for WHS violations
  - Employee handler applications
- No use of dormant sprays
- Currently no identified groundwater protection areas in county
- The frequency of headquarters employee safety inspections is currently every 2-3 years depending on the level of non-compliances. The frequency of dealer inspections is every 1-2 years. This frequency schedule allows for effective identification and enforcement action of non-compliances.

## **Weaknesses**

- Limited staff availability for compliance monitoring
  - Weekend or night time work when owner operator and reduced drift applications occur
  - Low number of follow up inspections
- Accessibility to sites is restricted due to locked gates and inability to visually see sites from the road to verify application activity
- Lack of bilingual staff making it difficult to conduct adequate fieldworker safety inspections

#### Goals or Objectives

- Assure that compliance monitoring is effective and comprehensive, ensuring the safety of pesticide handlers, fieldworkers, the public, and the environment through the use of an inspection strategy that has a measurable effect on compliance improvement.
- Increase compliance with pesticide laws and regulations involving pesticide use within Amador County.
- Outreach on compliance with dormant spray regulations
- Outreach on increase of awareness of surface and groundwater issues confronting California pesticide users.

#### Deliverables

- Maintain frequency of inspections for headquarters and dealers
- Maintain targeted inspections for situations where WHS violations have occurred in the past or have the potential to occur
- Increase targeted inspections when necessary for repeat violations
- Increase level of fieldworker safety inspections with assistance of DPR

#### Measuring Success

- Review of PRAMR to determine if there has been a decrease in the number of pesticide use and records inspections for targeted components
- Review of non-compliances as a result of targeted inspections
- Decrease in non-compliances found.

#### **Investigation Response and Reporting Improvement**

- Pesticide-related investigations are conducted by two trained staff:
  - Commissioner responsible for 25% of investigations, 40% of PUE duties
  - Agricultural Inspector responsible for 75% of investigations, 25% of PUE duties
- Complaints are received by secretary and recorded on an in-house form

- Once received they are given to the Commissioner either for investigation or assignment to staff
- All complaints or incidents that may be related to pesticides receive a response and results are documented on complaint forms or investigative reports
- All inspector investigation and complaint reports are reviewed and approved by the Commissioner once complete
- In last two fiscal years there has been 1 episode investigation and 3 complaints
- All were initiated within three days and completed within two weeks to one month
- All of the investigation reports were complete and none were returned for lack of additional information or supporting documentation

### Strengths

- Routing of the investigation/complaint goes directly to the Commissioner. Without any intermediate personnel the reports are processed in a timely manner
- Low number of investigations and complaints received by the county allows for ability to respond and complete investigations and reports in a timely manner.
- Staff has kept current with investigative training
- Experienced investigator with good writing skills
- Our investigative response and reporting has resulted in the following:
  - Effective in providing awareness for worker health and safety issues
  - Conclusive in explaining why or how the episode occurred
  - Allowed us to take appropriate enforcement action when causal violations were discovered
  - Allowed us to take preventative measures at the applicator/business/local program level

### Weaknesses

- No areas of investigation response or reporting were identified as needing improvement based on the last two fiscal year DPR Effectiveness Evaluations

### Goal or Objective

- Maintain implementation strategy of current investigative response with regard to:
  - timely initiation and completion of all priority and non-priority investigations
  - use of existing violation analysis and high quality in investigative thoroughness and report accuracy

### Deliverables

- Timely episode investigation initiation and completion
- Investigation reports that are accurate and complete

## Measure Success

- Review of the number of returned/incomplete investigation reports

## **C. Enforcement Response**

### **Enforcement Response Evaluation**

- All compliance and enforcement actions are prepared by one licensed staff with the exception of violation notices checked off at the time of inspections on inspection forms
  - Commissioner is responsible for 100% of enforcement actions, 50% of PUE duties
- Review of the last five years shows that all enforcement actions commenced within two years of the occurrence of the violation, primarily commencing within two months of violation
- Enforcement Response Regulation (ERR) is being implemented and followed to determine most appropriate response when violations and civil penalty actions are identified
- Staff has received DPR provided training on ERR implementation
- If the action or fine deviates from the regulation a justification will be written into the action
- Pesticide use report violations receive warning letters and notice of violations
- Worker health and safety violations receive civil penalty actions, unless first time paperwork violation
- Local worker health and safety violation issues are primarily:
  - Hazard Communication posting
  - Written training plan
  - Application specific information
- All NOPAs provide respondents with detailed information on alleged violations, proposed fine level, and their right for an opportunity to be heard
- A Pesticide Enforcement/Compliance Action Summary is prepared for every action
- All inspections and non-compliances are tracked on an electronic spreadsheet
- All actions are tracked on an electronic log
- Copies of inspection reports and actions are maintained in permit/OID or business files

## Strengths

- Limited chain of command within our office allows for timely review and approval of actions
- Maintaining copies of reports and actions within individual files allows for review of violator's history and selection of most appropriate action for the violation.

### Weaknesses

- Lack of staff availability for timely follow-up inspection activity

### Goal or Objective

- Provide a swift, consistent and fair response to non-compliances that results in future compliance by the respondent while working to maintain the respect of the regulated industry as well as maintaining the integrity of this office.

### Deliverables

- Review of Worker Health and Safety regulations annually at grower meetings
- Timely initiation of enforcement response
- Consideration of all appropriate enforcement options
  - Application of Enforcement Response Regulation
  - Use of Citable Sections as resource
  - Application of the Fine Guidelines
- Review of proposed enforcement action with EBL to ensure correct application of ERR
- Enforcement response log updated as actions are completed

### Measure Success

- Review of individual files to verify if decrease in repeat non-compliances by violators resulted from new enforcement response.
- Review of enforcement response to determine if effort was directed at violations that pose the greatest risk to people or the environment

## **PRIORITIES AND OTHER PESTICIDE REGULATORY ACTIVITIES**

The following statewide priorities and activities either do not occur or are not significant activities in Amador County and will not be addressed in this work plan at this time. If the status of these items changes to a county specific priority, the work plan will be amended to address them at that time.

- Non-Fumigant VOC Regulation Compliance
- Compliance with Soil Fumigant Phase II Labeling
- Chloropicrin mitigation measures when implemented by DPR
- Collaboration with State Regional Water Quality Board and DPR Environmental Monitoring Branch regarding applications of diazinon, chlorpyrifos and diuron near water bodies
- Activities related to the Secured Web Access illness investigation reporting
- Compliance with Ground Water Regulations
- Chilean Fruit air Monitoring and other commodity fumigation focused activities
- Investigations and cases for possible referral to DPR for state action
- Focused inspections on employers with employees under medical supervision
- Reporting to DPR, complaints or report of loss related to bee kills associated with an alleged pesticide application
- Collaboration with DPR in addressing U.S. EPA activities or requests

The following statewide priorities and activities do occur in Amador County and will be addressed in the following ways.

### **Structural inspection activity of Branch 1, 2 and 3 applications**

- Inspections for Branch 1 applications are always planned as a result of the NOI process in place
- There are currently only two Pest Control Businesses that perform Branch 1 applications in this county. Each business may perform one or two applications per calendar year. Each business will be targeted to receive one application inspection per year unless noncompliances are noted at which point that company will be inspected again in the current year if they perform work.
- Routine inspections for Branch 2 and 3 applications occur on a random basis by trained staff
- Target Branch 2 and 3 application inspections and increase inspection level if reoccurring noncompliances are documented

### **Training of county staff on pesticide law and regulation, DPR policy and compendiums**

- Current PUE staff have attended all applicable DPR training and will continue to make it a priority to attend annual updates and new training as they become available
- DPR policy and compendium updates will be distributed to all staff and reviewed

### **Compliance with school pesticide use reporting**

- There are three structural pest control business headquartered in the county
- Only one of the businesses has employees that handle pesticides
- During the headquarter inspection, a review of the school pesticide use reporting will be included for compliance
- Licensed staff participates in the annual local school district Integrated Pest Management training sessions in which pesticide use reporting is addressed

### **Regulatory outreach and education**

- Three 2 hour outreach/continuing education sessions are held each year in November and December
- Each session consists of a minimum of 1 hour of laws and regulations per session in addition to either 1 hour of other topics such as calibration, reduced risk pesticides, pesticide resistance, vineyard pests
- Target audience is Amador County grower certified private applicators
- Approximately 60 growers attend which represents the majority of certified private applicators in the county

### **Compliance with Non-Ag Surface Water Regulations**

- Non-Ag surface water regulations will become a prioritized item as part of an application inspection
- Any noncompliance of the regulations will be handled as all other regulation violations
- Because the majority of application inspections are random there will be no repeat inspections unless reoccurring noncompliances are identified

### **Ensure compliance with recent U.S. EPA approved rodenticide label changes**

- Use of rodenticides will require private applicator certification through an exam
- Applicants will be instructed on certification requirements and label requirements
- There are approximately 10 active permits for grower applied rodenticides and all applicators are certified
- Target increase of rodenticide application inspections for compliance and increase inspection level if reoccurring noncompliances are documented

### **CAC identified special projects/concerns**

- Based on the 2013-2015 Performance Evaluation Report for Amador County's Pesticide Regulatory Program there is a need to increase overall inspection numbers with emphasis in fieldworker safety inspections.
- Targeted fieldworker safety inspections will be increased with the assistance of DPR's EBL

| <b>Amador County Estimates for 2016-2018</b>         |                          |                          |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>Pesticide Use monitoring inspections per year</b> | <b>2016</b>              | <b>2017</b>              | <b>2018</b>              |
| Application Insp - Property Operator                 | 4                        | 5                        | 5                        |
| Application Insp - Pest Control Business             | 1                        | 2                        | 2                        |
| Application Insp - Branch 1                          | 1                        | 1                        | 1                        |
| Application Insp - Branch 2                          | 1                        | 2                        | 2                        |
| Application Insp - Branch 3                          | 0                        | 0                        | 0                        |
| Field Fumigations                                    | 0                        | 0                        | 0                        |
| Commodity Fumigations                                | 0                        | 0                        | 0                        |
| Mix/Load - Property Operator                         | 2                        | 2                        | 2                        |
| Mix/Load - Pest Control Business                     | 1                        | 2                        | 2                        |
| Mix/Load - Branch 2                                  | 0                        | 0                        | 0                        |
| Mix/Load - Branch 3                                  | 0                        | 0                        | 0                        |
| <b>Pest Control Records Inspections</b>              |                          |                          |                          |
| Business Records Inspections                         | 1                        | 2                        | 3                        |
| HQ/Employee Safety - Business                        | 1                        | 2                        | 3                        |
| Dealer Records Inspections                           | 0                        | 1                        | 1                        |
| Advisor Records Inspections                          | 1                        | 0                        | 1                        |
| HQ/Employee Safety - Production Ag.                  | 3                        | 3                        | 3                        |
| HQ/Employee Safety - Other                           | 1                        | 1                        | 2                        |
| <b>Structural Pest Control Inspections</b>           |                          |                          |                          |
| HQ/Employee Safety - Structural                      | 0                        | 1                        | 0                        |
| Structural Business Records                          | 0                        | 1                        | 0                        |
|  | <b>Total Inspections</b> | <b>Total Inspections</b> | <b>Total Inspections</b> |
|  | <b>2016</b>              | <b>2017</b>              | <b>2018</b>              |
| Total Number Inspections                             | 17                       | 25                       | 27                       |
| Number of Pre-Application Inspections                | 8                        | 8                        | 8                        |
| NOI'S reviewed                                       | 12                       | 12                       | 12                       |
| Site Evaluation Percentage                           | 50%                      | 50%                      | 50%                      |
| field worker Inspections                             | 2                        | 3                        | 3                        |

